

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 27, 2007. Claims 1-8, 11-12, 21-22 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aleck, U.S. Patent No. 3,592,360 in view of Krampe et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,290,801. Claims 9-10, 13-20 and 24-31 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With this Amendment, independent claim 7 is amended to require that the adhesive bond strength of the first adhesive contact is greater than the adhesive bond strength of the second adhesive contact. As such, amended claim 7 is now in condition for allowance. In view of the amendments to claim 7, dependent claim 9 is canceled. Claims 8 and 11 depend from claim 7, and are thus allowable therewith. Dependent claims 14-16 have been amended to depend from claim 7, and are also allowable therewith.

Independent claim 21 is amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 24, which is now canceled. Since claim 24 was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable, amended claim 21 is now in condition for allowance. Dependent claim 22 depends from claim 21 and is allowable therewith. Claims 25-27 originally depended from claim 24, and are amended to depend from claim 21. As such, claims 25-27 are also allowable.

Independent claim 39 is to a method of dispensing liquid from a container having a container body with an adhesive layer having a first adhesive contact with a rigid portion and a second adhesive contact with a liner portion. Claim 39 is amended to require that the adhesive bond strength of the first adhesive contact is greater than the adhesive bond strength of the second adhesive contact. Thus, claim 39, as amended, is allowable.

New Claims 41-52

Independent claim 41, similar to claim 39, is to a method of dispensing liquid from a container having a container body with an adhesive layer having a first adhesive contact with a rigid

portion and a second adhesive contact with a liner portion. Claim 41 requires that the adhesive bond strength of the first adhesive contact is less than the adhesive bond strength of the second adhesive contact. Thus, claim 41 is in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 42 is similar to claim 7, but claim 42 requires that the adhesive bond strength of the first adhesive contact is less than the adhesive bond strength of the second adhesive contact. Thus, claim 42 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 43-47 are similar to dependent claims 8, 11 and 14-16. Claims 43-47 depend from claim 42 and thus are allowable therewith.

Claim 48 includes the limitations from independent claim 21 and dependent claim 28, which was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Thus, amended claim 48 is in condition for allowance. (Claim 28, and dependent claims 29-31 are canceled.) Dependent claims 49 through 52 are similar to dependent claims 22 and 25-27. Claims 49 through 52 depend from claim 48 and thus are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

With this Amendment, claims 7-8, 11, 14-16, 21-22, 25-27, 39, and 41-52 are now in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 7/27/07

By: Brian R. Morrison

Brian R. Morrison, Reg. No. 58,455
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580